

4

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action dated March 16, 2004. Applicant has canceled claim 1 and added claims 2-21 to more clearly point out the present inventive concept. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Accordingly, claim 1 has been canceled.

The Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 2,812,616 (Ford). Claim 2 and 15 recite "a hollow, malleable frame." Ford does not teach a hollow, malleable frame. As such, Applicant requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn.

The Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,981,005 (Schiess). Claim 2 and 15 recite "a hollow, malleable frame." Schiess does not teach a hollow, malleable frame. As such, Applicant requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn.

The Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 4,123,872 (Silva). Claim 2 and 15 recite "a hollow, malleable frame." Silva does not teach a hollow, malleable frame. As such, Applicant requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of the claims as amended.

Respectfully submitted,



David C. Cain
Attorney for Applicant

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE
S/N Serial No. 10/007,478